

### **REMARKS**

The undersigned attorney thanks Examiner Sax for his careful review of this patent application and for his time in participating in a telephone conference on October 25, 2004. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-41, 44, 46-48, and 53-54 are currently pending in this Application with claims 1, 3, 8, 24, 25, 26, and 44 being amended, claims 53-54 being added and claims 42-43, and 49-52 being canceled. Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-44 and 46-52 were pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 24-29, 42-4, and 46-52 were rejected and claims 4, 12-23, and 30-41 were allowed.

#### **Examiner Interview on October 25, 2004**

During the telephone conference on October 25, 2004, Examiner Sax and the undersigned attorney discussed the pending claims and the cited references. As discussed, the Matsumoto reference and the Murphy reference disclose a single user interaction and are generally concerned with a referral to a web site. For example, a web site using the disclosure of Matsumoto or Murphy may identify a user as being referred from a particular third party web site and track whether the user completed a transaction on the destination web site. Conversely, the pending claims are directed toward a system and method for analyzing a plurality of user accesses to a plurality of objects of interest of a single web site. Accordingly, the present invention monitors user interaction with a web site and makes recommendations for modifying links between objects of interest within the web site to improve a user's experience with the web site.

Examiner Sax indicated that the present amendments likely overcome the present rejections, but stated that he would not be able to advance the current claims to issuance without conducting another search. Accordingly, the Applicant is filing a *Request for Continued Examination* to allow the Examiner to proceed with said search.

#### **Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 24-29, and 42-45 were initially rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Murphy (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,247).

The Examiner asserts that Murphy shows a method for modifying the structure of a network accessible website based on the analysis of activity associated with the website. Murphy is directed towards “automatically customizing a vendor’s web site, based on a web site customer’s previous location or terms used in a search by the customer.” (See Abstract). In essence, Murphy teaches that customization is done by analyzing the referral URL for a visitor arriving to the web site and tailoring the content of the page the user receives based on the location and search keywords found in the referral URL.

In contrast, the present invention is directed toward a system and method that tracks user movement *within* a web site and customizes structural relationships of the web site to improve the user experience. Accordingly, certain embodiments of the present invention are directed toward customizing a web site based on how users navigate the content of the web site. Additionally, certain embodiments of the present invention are directed toward identifying one or more structural relationships relating objects of interest within a web site and for modifying the structural relationship between objects of interest based on said recommendation.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 44 have been amended to more particularly describe these features of the present invention. Claims 1 and 44 have been amended to further define the elements of: “identifying a web site comprising a plurality of objects of interest; identifying one or more structural relationships relating the plurality of objects of interest; identifying a plurality of sequential user accesses to the plurality of objects of interest; maintaining data associating said objects of interest, structural relationships, and user accesses; and applying a set of rules to said data to generate a recommendation for modifying the structural relationship between objects of interest.” Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 1 and 44 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art and Applicants respectfully request passing of the case to issuance in due course of Patent Office business. Dependent claim 3, 8, 24, 25, and 26 have been amended to reflect the language of amended claim 1. Also, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-3, 5-11, 24-29, and 46-48 are also allowable for the various additional limitations contained therein, which further distinguish the prior art.

New claims 53-54, depending from independent claim 1, have been added. Claims 53-54 do not introduce any new matter.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections should be withdrawn and Claims 1-41, 44, 46-48, and 53-54 are in condition for allowance.

**FEES**

Through the present *Preliminary Amendment to the RCE*, four claims were canceled and two dependent claims were added. Thus, no additional claims fees are due. However, the Commissioner is authorized to debit deposit account No. 20-1507 for any required fees.

**CONCLUSION**

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the *Final Office Action* mailed 24 September 2004. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-41, 44, 46-48, and 53-54 are in condition for allowance and that each point raised in the *Final Office Action* with regard to these claims has been fully addressed. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn and that the case be processed to issuance in accordance with Patent Office Business.

If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please contact James Schutz at 404.885.3498.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

James E. Schutz  
Registration No. 48,658  
Attorney for Applicant

Troutman Sanders LLP  
600 Peachtree Street, NE  
Suite 5200  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308-2216  
(404) 885-3498